UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/422,593	10/21/1999	LEONARD CORNING LAHEY	B09-99-028	5731

7590   05/22/2003

KONRAD RAYNES VICTOR & MANN, LLP
315 S. BEVERLY DR.
210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA   90212

EXAMINER
BOYCE, ANDRE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

Office Action Summary	Application N . 09/422,593	Applicant(s) LAHEY ET AL.
	Examiner Andre Boyce	Art Unit 3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 March 2003</u> .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-39</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-6,13-15,17-19,26-28,30-32 and 39</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>3,7-12,16,20-25,29 and 33-38</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This Non-Final Office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed March

5, 2003. Claims 1, 14, and 27 have been amended. Claims 1-39 are pending.

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejected claims, as seen below have

been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 13-15, 18, 19, 26-28, 31, 32, and 39 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yosefi (USPN 5,649,220), in view of Hsu

et al (USPN 5,581,691).

As per claim 1, Yosefi discloses a workflow management method for creating

and delivering output material (artwork design and production system, see Figure 3),

comprising generating a customer record (job ticket record, see column 7, lines 38-

42) to include fields specifying at least one product (job number), customer

preferences (pages and size), and a selected <u>delivery option indicating a</u> method to

deliver generated output material (i.e., preparation devices users can select

including RIP, forming interpreter 118, see column 8, lines 10-14 and column 10,

lines 32-37) on the product specified in the customer record, adding a job record (job

ticket record) including a status field to a job status table for the customer record

(status report managed by workflow manager 114, see column 11, lines 47-51),

invoking a first worker if the selected job has a first status, generating, with the first

worker, output material from processing the product and customer preference fields

in the customer record for the selected job (i.e., first specific worker performs

respective operations according to workflow of job ticket record, see column 8, lines

1-6), invoking a second worker if the selected job has the second status,

determining, with the second worker, a selected one of a plurality of delivery options

from the customer record for the selected job (second specific worker next in

workflow of job ticket record), and transmitting the output material via the determined

delivery option to the customer specified in the customer record (transmitted to

customer via customer address, stored in record, see column 7, lines 38-42).

Yosefi does not disclose setting the job record to a first status, processing a selected

job, and setting the status for the selected job to a second status after generating the

output material with the first worker. Hsu et al disclose a history database 116,

which is a log record database that can be inspected to determine the current status

of any ongoing workflow (see column 4, lines 39-43). Both Yosefi and Hsu et al are

concerned with the effective management of workflows, therefore it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a database in Yosefi, as seen in Hsu et al, as an efficient means of monitoring the current status of the job ticket record.

As per claim 2, Yosefi discloses accessing at least one content file (menu 130) by processing a database table (selection are 120) using values in the customer record associated with the job, and generating the content of each file into the output material (i.e., user performs layout vie secondary menu 132 displaying various layout devices, as determined via information from job ticket record, see column 8, lines 7-14).

As per claim 5, Yosefi does not disclose determining with the first and second workers, whether an error occurred while processing the job, setting the status in the job status table for the selected job to an error status, invoking an error worker if the job has the error status, performing error recovery with the error worker, and setting the status of the job to the first and second status after recovery. Hsu et al disclose determining whether an error occurred while processing the job (exception, see column 7, lines 8-11), invoking an error worker if the job has the error status (compensation routine, see column 7, lines 8-11), performing error recovery with the error worker, and setting the status of the job to the first or second status after recovery (see column 7, lines 12-20). Both Yosefi and Hsu et al are concerned with the effective management of workflows, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include determining whether an error occurred and performing error recovery in Yosefi, as

seen in Hsu et al, as an efficient means of processing errors occurred during the workflow of the job ticket record.

As per claim 6, Yosefi discloses a supervisor program (workflow manager 114) that polls the job status table, performs the steps of invoking the first and second workers, and processes every record in the job status table when performing the polling operation (i.e., mark the display of the workflow to indicate which operations have already been performed and which are current, thus polling the status, see column 8, lines 39-43).

As per claim 13, Yosefi discloses multiple workers each associated with one input status and at least one output status (i.e., multiple users performing their respective operations listed in the workflow, see column 8, lines 1-3), wherein the status of the job is updated to one associated output status after one worker completes processing the job, wherein the output status for one worker is the input status associated with one other worker and wherein the definition of input and output statuses for workers defines the workflow of the job (i.e., status is determined by workflow manager 114 as being complete or current, thus determining the workflow, see column 8, lines 39-43).

Claims (14, 15, 18, 19, and 26) and (27, 28, 31, 32, and 39) are rejected based upon the rejections of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 13, since they are the system and article of manufacture claims, respectively, corresponding to the method claims.

5.   Claims 4, 17, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Yosefi (USPN 5,649,220), in view of Hsu et al (USPN 5,581,691), in further

view of Milsted et al (USPN 6,345,256)

As per claim 4, Yosefi does not discloses the first status associated with the first

worker and the second status associated with the second worker, wherein the first

and second workers queries the job status table to access all jobs having the

associated status. Hsu et al disclose the first status being associated with the first

worker and the second status being associated with the second worker. The

resource resolution function ID 236 (see column 15, 50-54), points directly to the

resource (worker) doing the step. Milsted et al disclose the work flow manager 154,

using application programming interfaces (APIs) to perform status queries (see

column 51, lines 20-24 and 44). Yosefi and Milsted are concerned with the effective

management of workflows, therefore it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the first and

second workers to query the status table to access all associated jobs, in the Yosefi,

as seen in the Milsted et al, thus dividing the status querying function between

several resources, thereby improving the efficiency of the method.

Claims 17 and 30 are rejected based upon the rejections of claim 4, since they

are the system and article of manufacture claims, respectively, corresponding to the

method claim.

Allowable Subject Matter

6.   Claims 3, 7-12, 16, 20-25, 29, and 33-38 are objected to as being dependent

upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form

including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

-Tarumi et al (USPN 5,918,226) discloses a workflow defining portion for defining

information necessary for operating workflow job.

-Arai et al (US 2002/0046072) discloses defining a sub-workflow which

determines a workflow.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Andre Boyce whose telephone number is (703) 305-

1867. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone numbers

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-

7687 for regular communications and After Final communications, and (703) 746-

7305 for informal/draft communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)

308-1113.

adb
May 17, 2003

TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600